



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/554,674	05/17/2000	HORST FROESSL	58-39-3	3244
805	7590	09/19/2006	EXAMINER	
WALTER C. FARLEY P O BOX 329 HARPSWELL, ME 04079			LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/554,674	Applicant(s) FROESSL, HORST	
	Examiner Christian La Forgia	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-48 and 50-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-48 and 50-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment of 05 July 2006 has been noted and made of record.
2. Claims 24-48 and 50-53 have been presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 05 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. In response to applicant's argument that the cited prior art does not disclose repeatedly and automatically reviewing the content of output documents to identify content that is repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, thereby reducing the volume of unique data to be added to the output documents, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.
5. In response to the Applicant's arguments that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest repeatedly and automatically reviewing the text of content of output documents to identify phrases that are repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, the Examiner disagrees. As noted below in column 1, lines 60-63 and column 3, lines 48-61, as well as the abstract and column 1, lines 44-46, Notenboom (USPN 4,955,066) discloses performing repeated levels of compression to minimize the storage space required. Furthermore, Notenboom discloses the helpmake program at column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 6, which is a program used to perform the repeated levels of compression.

Art Unit: 2131

6. Therefore, Notenboom teaches repeatedly and automatically reviewing the text of content of output documents to identify phrases that are repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code and the rejection is maintained.

7. In response to the Applicant's arguments that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest repeatedly and automatically reviewing the text of content of output documents to identify phrases that are repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, the Examiner disagrees. As noted below in column 1, lines 66-68 and column 3, lines 55-68, as well as the abstract and column 1, lines 49-51, Notenboom2 (USPN 5,109,433) discloses performing repeated levels of compression to minimize the storage space required. Furthermore, Notenboom2 discloses the helpmake program at column 3, lines 3-23, which is a program used to perform the repeated levels of compression.

8. Therefore, Notenboom2 teaches repeatedly and automatically reviewing the text of content of output documents to identify phrases that are repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code and the rejection is maintained.

9. Applicant's arguments with regards to Smith in view of Crandall fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

10. With respect to the Applicant's allegation that the cited prior art references (Notenboom, Notenboom2, Crandall) do not disclose repeatedly and automatically reviewing the text of content of output documents to identify phrases that are repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, the Examiner directs the Applicant's attention to MPEP §

Art Unit: 2131

2131, in particular the discussion of *ipsissimis verbis*. *Ipsissimis verbis* statest hat the elements of the invention must be arranged as required by the claim regardless of the identity of terminology. In other words, the fact that the cited references do not use the same terminology as the Applicant, yet teaches the elements of the claim language, is not enough to distinguish the instant application over the prior art.

11. See further rejections below.

Claim Rejections

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

13. Claims 24-46, 50, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,599 to Smith et al., hereinafter Smith, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,955,066 to Notenboom, hereinafter Notenboom, OR U.S. Patent No. 5,109,433 to Notenboom, hereinafter Notenboom2, OR U.S. Patent No. 5,999,949 to Crandall, hereinafter Crandall.

14. As per claims 24, 30, and 31, Smith teaches a method of generating and transmitting information between two service centers comprising

providing means of communication between the service centers between which generated output documents may be sent or received (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

storing in electronic form at each service center a copy of each output document (Figures 4 [block 42], 8 [blocks 94, 96], 16 [blocks 192, 194]; column 4, lines 39-53; column 9, lines 43-67).

Art Unit: 2131

15. Smith does not teach repeatedly and automatically reviewing the content of output documents to identify content that is repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, thereby reducing the volume of unique data to be added to the output documents.

16. Notenboom teaches reviewing the content of output documents to identify content that is repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, thereby reducing the volume of unique data to be added to the output documents (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 60-63, column 3, lines 48-61).

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying frequently occurring words and phrases of a document and associating them with an access code, since Notenboom states at column 2, lines 17-24 that such a compression technique would allow for the decompression and presentation of the data to be handled rapidly. Notenboom also states at column 2, lines 37-53 that such a compression technique would allow the files to be compressed enough so that they would be transported easily, as disclosed on floppy disks. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize the importance of compressing a file to the size of a floppy disk for making transmission of said file over a network that much more efficient. Additionally it has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefits of repeating steps and performing them automatically. See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

18. Notenboom2 teaches reviewing the content of output documents to identify content that is repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, thereby reducing the

Art Unit: 2131

volume of unique data to be added to the output documents (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 66-68, column 3, lines 55-68).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying frequently occurring words and phrases of a document and associating them with an access code, since Notenboom2 states at column 2, line 23-30 that such a compression technique would allow for the decompression and presentation of the data to be handled rapidly. Notenboom2 also states at column 2, lines 43-59 that such a compression technique would allow the files to be compressed enough so that they would be transported easily, as disclosed on floppy disks. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize the importance of compressing a file to the size of a floppy disk for making transmission of said file over a network that much more efficient. Additionally it has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefits of repeating steps and performing them automatically.

See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

20. Crandall teaches reviewing the content of output documents to identify content that is repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, thereby reducing the volume of unique data to be added to the output documents (column 5, line 26 to column 9, line 48).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying frequently occurring words and phrases of a document and associating them with an access code, since Crandall states at column 2, lines 52-63 that such a modification would compress a text document so that it may be compactly stored, rapidly transmitted and quickly expanded without need for supplemental decompression information. Additionally it has

been held that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefits of repeating steps and performing them automatically. See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

22. Regarding claim 25, Smith does not teach wherein the reviewing step includes searching through the stored information and selecting parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code.

23. Notenboom teaches wherein the reviewing step includes searching through the stored information and selecting parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 60-63, column 3, lines 48-61).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code for similar reasons to those discussed above.

25. Notenboom2 teaches wherein the reviewing step includes searching through the stored information and selecting parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 66-68, column 3, lines 55-68).

Art Unit: 2131

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code for similar reasons to those discussed above.

27. Crandall teaches wherein the reviewing step includes searching through the stored information and selecting parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code (column 5, line 26 to column 9, line 48).

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code for similar reasons to those discussed above.

29. With regards to claim 26, Smith does not teach transmitting the resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center.

30. Notenboom teaches transmitting the resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center (Figure 1 [blocks 23, 24], column 5, lines 43-53).

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which

Art Unit: 2131

identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center for similar reasons to those discussed above.

32. Notenboom2 teaches transmitting the resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center (Figure 1 [blocks 23, 24], column 5, lines 56-66).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center for similar reasons to those discussed above.

34. Crandall teaches transmitting the resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center (column 13, line 23 to column 14, line 25).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center for similar reasons to those discussed above.

36. Regarding claim 27, Smith teaches providing at each service center a control computer, a client memory and means for producing an output document from the client memory (Figure 7 [blocks 72, 78, 88], 11, 17 [blocks 12, 198]; column 6, lines 26-32; column 7, lines 27-37);

wherein the storing step comprises storing in the client memory data comprising parts of documents to be generated in response to a request received from a client, generating and storing

Art Unit: 2131

a document output of selected format and content and designating unique data (column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 14; column 14, lines 36-54).

37. Smith does not teach wherein the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated.

38. Notenboom teaches wherein the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 60-63, column 3, lines 48-61).

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated, for reasons similar to those discussed above.

40. Notenboom2 teaches wherein the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 66-68, column 3, lines 55-68).

41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data and

adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated, for reasons similar to those discussed above.

42. Crandall teaches wherein the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated (column 5, line 26 to column 9, line 48).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated, for reasons similar to those discussed above.

44. Regarding claim 28, Smith teaches including the step of encrypting each output document (column 13, lines 18-32).

45. As per claims 29 and 50, Smith teaches a method for generating and disseminating information comprising the steps of:

establishing at least two client service centers each for the use of system users, the service centers each including a computer and associated memory (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

providing means of electronic communication between the service centers for sending and receiving generated output documents and requests for documents between the service centers (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

storing in the memory at each client service center data comprising parts of documents to be compiled with additional data received from clients to form an output document (Figure 7 [block 78]; column 14, lines 42-54);

compiling and storing output documents of selected format and content and designated unique data by substituting in response to requests from clients the storage access codes of the document parts identified in and by document output compilation requests from clients (column 14, lines 42-54); and

transmitting the output documents to a recipient service center thereby reducing unique data to be added to output documents (Figure 20 [blocks 325, 330]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 9, lines 43-67; column 10, line 52 to column 6, line 14; column 14, lines 42-54).

46. Smith does not teach reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the output documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents, and generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled.

Art Unit: 2131

47. Notenboom teaches reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the output documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents; and, generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 60-63, column 3, lines 48-61).

48. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying frequently occurring words and phrases of a document and associating them with an access code, since Notenboom states at column 2, lines 17-24 that such a compression technique would allow for the decompression and presentation of the data to be handled rapidly. Notenboom also states at column 2, lines 37-53 that such a compression technique would allow the files to be compressed enough so that they would be transported easily, as disclosed on floppy disks. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize the importance of compressing a file to the size of a floppy disk for making transmission of said file over a network that much more efficient. Additionally it has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefits of repeating steps and performing them automatically. See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

49. Notenboom2 teaches reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the output documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents; and, generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated

Art Unit: 2131

storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled (Figure 1 [block 16], column 1, lines 66-68, column 3, lines 55-68).

50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying frequently occurring words and phrases of a document and associating them with an access code, since Notenboom2 states at column 2, line 23-30 that such a compression technique would allow for the decompression and presentation of the data to be handled rapidly. Notenboom2 also states at column 2, lines 43-59 that such a compression technique would allow the files to be compressed enough so that they would be transported easily, as disclosed on floppy disks. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize the importance of compressing a file to the size of a floppy disk for making transmission of said file over a network that much more efficient. Additionally it has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefits of repeating steps and performing them automatically.

See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

51. Crandall teaches reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the output documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents; and, generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled (column 5, line 26 to column 9, line 48).

52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying frequently occurring words and phrases of a document and associating

them with an access code, since Crandall states at column 2, lines 52-63 that such a modification would compress a text document so that it may be compactly stored, rapidly transmitted and quickly expanded without need for supplemental decompression information. Additionally it has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefits of repeating steps and performing them automatically. See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

53. Regarding claim 32, Smith teaches including assigning a portion of the client memory to each of the plurality of clients (Figure 4 [block 46], 7 [block 78]; column 4, lines 24-63).

54. Regarding claim 33, Smith teaches electronically interconnecting the service centers with each other for bi-directional communication between each service center and each other service center (Figure 15 [block 182], 20 [blocks 325, 330]; column 12, lines 23-53; column 15, lines 27-40).

55. Regarding claim 34, Smith teaches establishing a storage access and compilation code having a recognizable format for transmission by a client to a service center to request a document, the code being recognizable by the control computer to identify the client, a document format and selectable items of document content including items of unique data, whereby the control computer selects one or more document components from the client's assigned memory portion, and assembles the components to form the requested document (column 9, lines 42-67).

56. Regarding claim 35, Smith teaches including electronically transmitting the document output to the recipient (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 168, 170, 184]; column 7, lines 12-27; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24).

57. Regarding claim 36, Smith teaches including transmitting a printed copy of the document output to the recipient (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 176, 178, 188], 18 and 19 [block 178]; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24; column 11, lines 3-14).

58. Regarding claim 37, Smith teaches wherein the service center comprises facsimile receiving and transmitting equipment (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 172, 174, 186]; column 5, lines 10-30; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24).

59. With regards to claim 38, Smith teaches including transmitting the document output to the recipient by facsimile transmission (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 172, 174, 186]; column 5, lines 10-30; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24).

60. Regarding claim 39, Smith teaches wherein the service center comprises printing and mailing equipment (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 176, 178, 188], 18 and 19 [block 178]; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24; column 11, lines 3-14). Smith teaches printing out received documents and receiving e-mail notifications that a document has been received.

Art Unit: 2131

61. Regarding claim 40, Smith teaches wherein the step of generating includes adding a date to the generated document identifying original date of transmission from the client (column 4, lines 53-60).

62. Regarding claim 41, Smith teaches including electronically marking the generated document with preselected identifying information (column 4, lines 53-60).

63. With regards to claim 42, Smith teaches including providing an electronically stored copy of each transmitted document and identifying information to the client (Figures 4 [block 42], 8 [blocks 94, 96], 16 [blocks 192, 194]; column 4, lines 39-53; column 9, lines 43-67).

64. Regarding claim 43, Smith teaches and including translating the requested document into a selected language other than the language of the original request, and transmitting the document or parts thereof in the selected language (column 8, lines 10-65). Smith teaches documents being transferred between California and Japan, thus it would have been obvious to include translating means.

65. Regarding claim 44, Smith teaches and including storing at the service center a copy in electronic, computer-readable form of each output document for a client, and providing to selected recipients output documents for said recipients in computer-readable electronic form without regard to the form in which the output document is initially transmitted to the recipient (column 9, lines 42-67).

66. Regarding claim 45, Smith teaches wherein the request received from a client can be received in any one of a plurality of communication forms including facsimile and electronic transmission, and wherein the step of transmitting the document output to a designated recipient includes transmitting by a communication form selected for efficiency without regard for the form of request transmission from the client to the service center (Figures 14 and 15; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24).

67. Regarding claim 46, Smith teaches including assigning a common portion of the client memory to all clients, the common portion being available to any client, and storing in the common portion phrases and sentences commonly usable by multiple clients (Figure 7 [blocks 72, 78, 88], 11, 17 [blocks 12, 198]; column 6, lines 26-32; column 7, lines 27-37; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 14; column 14, lines 36-54).

68. Regarding claim 51, Smith teaches wherein said service center is geographically significantly closer to said recipient than to said client (column 8, lines 10-65).

69. Claims 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Notenboom, Notenboom2, or Crandall as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,468 to Suzuki et al., hereinafter Suzuki.

70. Regarding claim 47, Smith and Notenboom, Notenboom2, or Crandall do not teach wherein the client memory includes stored graphic elements and the step of generating a

Art Unit: 2131

document output includes compiling the document from the graphic elements stored at the service center.

71. Suzuki teaches wherein the client memory includes stored graphic elements and the step of generating a document output includes compiling the document from the graphic elements stored at the service center (column 11, line 42 to column 12, line 10).

72. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing for a system that would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring images.

73. Regarding claim 48, Smith and Notenboom, Notenboom2, or Crandall do not teach wherein the client memory includes stored graphic elements and the step of generating includes transmitting selected codes from the client to the service center for selecting and manipulating the stored elements to create and modify graphical creations at the service center.

74. Suzuki teaches wherein the client memory includes stored graphic elements and the step of generating includes transmitting selected codes from the client to the service center for selecting and manipulating the stored elements to create and modify graphical creations at the service center (column 11, line 42 to column 12, line 10).

- 75. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it would reduce the amount of data to be

Art Unit: 2131

added to documents, thus providing for a system that would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring images.

76. Claims 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Notenboom, Notenboom2, or Crandall as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,241,466 to Perry et al., hereinafter Perry.

77. Regarding claim 52, Smith and Notenboom, Notenboom2, or Crandall do not teach means at said service centers for storing documents available for sale, and means for printing and dispensing the documents in response to receipt of payment.

78. Perry teaches means at said service centers for storing documents available for sale (column 2, lines 31-64), and

means for printing and dispensing the documents in response to receipt of payment (column 2, lines 31-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to require means for payment per document. One would be motivated to include such retribution for the document to cover storage and maintenance fees for the servers and various services provided.

79. Regarding claim 53, Smith and Notenboom, Notenboom2, or Crandall do not teach including means responsive to voice input for generating text.

80. Perry teaches including means responsive to voice input for generating text (Abstract; column 5, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include voice input for generating text. One would be motivated to do

Art Unit: 2131

include this input device as it would provide a convenient method to update personal information, such as preferences, order a file via an automated system, or update a personal document, such as a will or other legal document.

Conclusion

81. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


82. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

83. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

84. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2131

85. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christian LaForgia 
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

clf

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

 9/14/06